



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Sn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,760	04/17/2001	Michael Proppe	0382/1D761	8903
7590	03/29/2005		EXAMINER	
DR MICHAEL B PROPP ADAPTIVE NETWORKS 94 WELLS AVENUE NEWTON, MA 02159			AHN, SAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2637	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/837,760	PROPP ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sam K. Ahn	2637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment, received on 01/24/05.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 4-8,12-16,19 and 21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 9-11,17,18 and 20 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 4-6,8,12-14,19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki USP 6,275,547 B1 in view of McDermott et al. USP 5,926,053 (McDermott).

Regarding claim 4, Saeki teaches (see Fig.1) a first delay device (101,102), a second delay device (105), and a sampling signal line coupled to, and configured to provide a sampling signal (extracted clock) based on an output of a first delay device (101,102), and a sampling device (106) coupled to an output of the second delay device (105) and coupled to the sampling signal line, the sampling device configured to sample the output of the second delay device based on a value of the sampling signal. However, Saeki does not explicitly teach the first and second delay device having a control input and a control signal line coupled to provide a control signal to, the control input of the first and second delay device, the control signal being based on an output of the first delay device and on a clock.

McDermott teaches (see Fig.4) a first (308) and second (307) delay device including a control input (to receive ADJ1, ADJ2), and a control signal line (from Control Logic,306 coupling to the delay devices) configured to provide a control signal (ADJ1, ADJ2) to, the control input of the first and second delay device, the control signal being based on an output of the first delay device (DLY2 feeding Control Logic) and on a clock (CLK).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Saeki's system to include the teaching of McDermott to include the control inputs in the delay devices and further including the Control Logic to provide the control signal to the delay devices for the purpose of increasing the system performance by including a function of controlling the duration of delay line.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4. McDermott further teaches a comparator (310,311 in Fig.6) that includes a first input coupled to an output of the first delay device (receiving DLY2), a second input coupled to the clock (CLK), and an output coupled to the control signal line (from Control Logic,306 coupling to the delay devices), providing an error signal (INC, DEC) between the output of the first delay device and the clock.

Regarding claim 8, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4. Saeki further teaches wherein the first delay device (101,102) includes multiple outputs (A,B), the sampling signal line (outputting 110) is coupled to the multiple outputs, and the sampling signal is based on the multiple outputs.

Regarding claim 12, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4. Saeki further teaches wherein the sampling device comprises a latch (106).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4. Saeki and McDermott further teach wherein the first and second delay device comprises a first and second delay line, respectively.

Regarding claims 19 and 21, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4 or 14. Saeki further teaches wherein the second delay line comprises an input configured to be coupled to a data source (107) and is configured to hold data representing one bit of the data source (see 107 in Fig.2B wherein one bit of the data source is input to the delay circuit).

2. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki USP 6,275,547 B1 in view of McDermott et al. USP 5,926,053 (McDermott) and Cranford, Jr. et al. USP 6,721,379 B1 (Cranford).

Regarding claim 7, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 4. McDermott further teaches adjustment device disposed between the output of the comparator and the control signal line, and configured to provide the control signal (ADJ1, ADJ2) on the control signal line based on the error signal (INC, DEC). However, McDermott does not explicitly teach wherein the adjustment device is a voltage adjustment device.

Cranford teaches (see Fig.2) a voltage adjustment device (22" charge pump) receiving error signal (UP, DW), and adjusting the control signal (Control Voltage, CIN) delivered to delay devices (22',26). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify McDermott's system to include Cranford's charge pump receiving error signals as it is well-known in the art to implement the charge pump coupled to a comparator.

3. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki USP 6,275,547 B1 in view of McDermott et al. USP 5,926,053 (McDermott) and Eitan (cited previously).

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Saeki in view of McDermott teach all subject matter claimed, as applied to claim 13. Although Saeki teaches an inverter in the first delay line (15) and further suggests that a ring oscillator may be combined with

delay circuit (note col.11, lines 9-11), Saeki in view of McDermott do not explicitly teach wherein the first delay line includes cascaded inverters including an odd number of inverters.

Eitan teaches (see Fig.1) cascaded inverters including an odd number of inverters (30, note col.1, lines 13-27) forming a ring oscillator. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Saeki's first delay line to include the odd number of inverters for the purpose of having a ring oscillator in the clock recovery circuit.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 22 and 23 are allowed.
5. Claims 9-11,17,18 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Present application discloses a circuit comprising a first and second delay device, a control signal line, a sampling signal line and a sampling device as configured in Fig.1 of this application. Prior arts, Saeki, McDermott and Eitan teach all the elements recited. However, prior art do not teach or suggest in combination of having an exclusive-OR device as recited, second delay device including multiple outputs wherein each output is coupled to the sampling device, and further do not teach or suggest in combination a level on the supply voltage

input of the first delay line affecting the switching speed of the cascaded inverters. And further, prior art does not teach wherein the cascaded inverters are arranged in a feedback configuration and at least two consecutive inverters are configured with common initial conditions so as to produce a distinctive pattern during operation of the first delay line.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Ahn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3044. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam K. Ahn
3/17/05


3/18/05
TEMESGHEN GHEBRETIINSAE
PRIMARY EXAMINER